

## REMARKS

### 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Edens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,537), hereinafter referred to as "Edens." Claims 1, 8, and 14 are amended herein and recite:

a housing configured to be accessible to a user;  
electronic circuitry residing within said housing for multiplexing data transfer between a first network interface and a plurality of client devices;  
a plurality of interchangeable client interfaces for communicatively coupling said plurality of client devices with said electronic circuitry;  
a faceplate configured to be coupled with said housing and configured to hold a plurality of interface adapters; and  
said plurality of interface adapters for holding said plurality of interchangeable client interfaces in a substantially fixed position relative to said faceplate.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Edens does not teach or suggest the claim limitations recited in Claims 1, 8, and 14 of the present invention. For example, Edens does not teach or suggest that the client interfaces are meant to be interchangeable. On page 12, lines 6-12, the instant application recites:

In the preferred embodiment of the present invention, a faceplate for data concentrator 201 is provided which can hold various interface adapters. These interface adapters fixedly support the client interfaces within uniformly sized openings in the cover of the data concentrator so that the client interfaces can not move around and be damaged. In so doing, the present invention facilitates installing different communications jacks into an intelligent data concentrator without having to substantially modify the concentrator itself.

In other words, to change from one type of client interface to another, the cover is removed and the client interface and its associated interface adapter, are removed from the data concentrator. The new client interface, and its associated

interface adapter, is then inserted into data concentrator 210 and the cover is replaced.

The rejection cites adapter 4550 of Figure 21d of Eden as being comparable to the interface adapters recited in Claims 1, 8, and 14 of the present invention. The Applicants respectfully submit that adapter 4550 is a network adapter for interfacing variety of electronic components and is not comparable to the interface adapters recited in Claims 1, 8, and 14 of the present invention. For example, in column 93, lines 29-37 Edens recites:

Network adapter 4550 interfaces with a Motorola 56302 digital signal processor (DSP) 4000 (which includes 24 MB of DRAM4545) via host interface bus 4570, DMA bus 4560 and two RS232 serial interfaces 4554 and 4556 for exchanging stream data (e.g., network nibble streams) with the logical ring network. DSP 4000 processes digital data from the logical ring network (via network adapter 4550) and from analog/digital inputs to Digital Preamplifier and Mixer 4500 (discussed below).

Referring again to the above cited page 12, lines 6-12, the instant application recites (emphasis added):

In the preferred embodiment of the present invention, a faceplate for data concentrator 201 is provided which can hold various interface adapters. These interface adapters fixedly support the client interfaces within uniformly sized openings in the cover of the data concentrator so that the client interfaces can not move around and be damaged. In so doing, the present invention facilitates installing different communications jacks into an intelligent data concentrator without having to substantially modify the concentrator itself.

In other words, the interface adapters of the present invention simply adapt the various physical configurations of the different client interfaces to the standardized openings in the cover of the data concentrator. In so doing, the client interfaces can be added to the data concentrator without modifying the data

concentrator itself simply by selecting an interface adapter appropriate for that type of client interface. Instead, the appropriate client interface is selected based upon which type of client interface is being installed into data concentrator 201. The Applicants respectfully submit that Edens does not teach or suggest an interface adapter for holding a client interface in a substantially fixed position relative to a faceplate as recited in Claims 1, 8, and 14 of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 1, 8, and 14 of the present invention are not anticipated by Edens and that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are overcome.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected Claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date:

7/19/04

John P. Wagner, Jr.  
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060